	Case 1:25-cv-00107-KES-SKO	Document 15	Filed 07/01/25	Page 1 of 3
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	A.E.,	No	o. 1:25-cv-00107-K	ES-SKO (HC)
12	Petitioner,		ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS, GRANTING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS	
13	v.	M		
14	TONYA ANDREWS, Facility Administrator,	CC	ORPUS, DIRECTIN	NG RESPONDENT TO EARING BEFORE AN
15	Respondent.	IM	IMIGRATION JUD	OGE, AND DIRECTING TO ENTER JUDGMENT
16			ND CLOSE CASE	
17		Do	ocs. 1, 11, 14	
18	Detate and A.E. to an impartance of the first state			
19	Petitioner A.E. is an immigration detainee proceeding with a petition for writ of habeas			
20 21	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.			
22	On May 16, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations to			
23	deny respondent Tonya Andrews' motion to dismiss, to grant the petition, and to direct			
24	respondent to provide petitioner with a bond hearing before an immigration judge at which			
25	respondent must justify petitioner's continued detention by clear and convincing evidence.			
26	Doc. 14. ¹ Those findings and recommendations were served upon all parties and contained notice			
27				
28	¹ The findings and recommendations also recommended dismissing all named respondents except Andrews, the warden of the facility where petitioner is being held. Doc. 14 at 1 n.1.			
		1	Č	

Case 1:25-cv-00107-KES-SKO Document 15 Filed 07/01/25 Page 2 of 3 1 that any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days after service. No 2 objections have been filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. 3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has conducted a de 4 novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the Court concludes that the findings 5 and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. 6 In the event a notice of appeal is filed, a certificate of appealability will not be required 7 because this is not a final order in a habeas proceeding in which the detention complained of 8 arises out of process issued by a state court. Forde v. U.S. Parole Commission, 114 F.3d 878 (9th 9 Cir. 1997); see Ojo v. INS, 106 F.3d 680, 681-682 (5th Cir. 1997); Bradshaw v. Story, 86 F.3d 164, 166 (10th Cir. 1996). 10 11 /// 12 /// 13 /// 14 /// 15 /// 16 /// 17 /// /// 18 19 /// 20 /// 21 /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// /// 28

Case 1:25-cv-00107-KES-SKO Document 15 Filed 07/01/25 Page 3 of 3 1 Accordingly, 2 1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 16, 2025, Doc. 14, are adopted 3 in full; 2. All named respondents except Tonya Andrews, the warden of the facility where 4 5 petitioner is being held, are dismissed; 6 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to update the docket to reflect that all respondents 7 except Tonya Andrews have been terminated; 4. 8 Respondent Andrews' motion to dismiss, Doc. 11, is denied; 9 5. The petition for writ of habeas corpus, Doc. 1, is granted; 10 6. Respondent is directed to schedule a bond hearing before an immigration judge 11 within thirty (30) days of the date of service of this Order, wherein respondent 12 must justify petitioner's continued detention by clear and convincing evidence, or 13 in the alternative, release petitioner under appropriate conditions of supervision. 7. 14 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment and close the case; and 8. 15 In the event a notice of appeal is filed, a certificate of appealability is not required. 16 17 IT IS SO ORDERED. 18 19 Dated: June 30, 2025 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28